

REMARKS

Claims 2, 3, 20-24, 38, 42, 44-46 and 48-50 presently appear in this case. Claims 44-46 have been allowed. The remaining claims have been rejected. The official action of May 4, 2007, has now been carefully studied. Reconsideration and allowance are hereby respectfully urged.

Briefly, the present invention relates to an isolated protein capable of binding to tumor necrosis factor receptor-associated 2 protein (TRAF2), which is either a polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:3 or variant thereof that has no more than 10 amino acid changes from the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:3 and retains its capability of binding to TRAF2. The invention further relates to compositions comprising such protein and molecules having the antigen-binding portion of an antibody capable of binding to such protein.

Claims 2, 42, 43 and 49, and claims dependent therefrom have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The examiner states that claim 2 recites a protein comprising a polypeptide consisting of a particular amino acid sequence as do claims 42 and 43. The examiner considers this unclear as to whether applicant intends a TRAF2 binding protein that consists of SEQ ID NO:3 or that comprises SEQ ID NO:3. This part of the rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to this part of the rejection, claims 2 and 42 have now been amended to delete the "consisting of" language and claim 43 has been deleted. Now claim 2 specifies that said protein comprises a polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:3. Consistent amendments have been made to paragraph (B) and claim 42. Claim 43 has now been deleted, thus obviating the rejection of this claim. Accordingly, it is believed that this rejection has now been obviated.

The examiner states that claim 49 is indefinite with respect to the residues that are within parentheses.

The parentheses are explained in the speciation in the paragraph bridging pages 47 and 48. Nevertheless, as they are not necessary in claim 49, the parentheses have now been deleted so as to obviate this part of the rejection. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are therefore respectfully urged.

Claims 2, 20-24, 38 and 42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is noted that claim 47 is not subject to this rejection. Accordingly, the subject matter of claim 47 has now been inserted into claim 2. Claim 2 is now effectively claim 47 rewritten in independent form. As all of the remaining claims ultimately depend from claim 2, they all have written description support for the same reason that the examiner has conceded that claim 47 has written description

support. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully urged.

Claims 2, 20-24, 38, 40 and 42-43 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C., first paragraph, as failing to comply with enablement rejection. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is also noted that claim 47 has not been included in the enablement rejection. Accordingly, as claim 2 has now been rewritten as claim 47 in independent form, it is no longer subject to the enablement rejection and all the claims dependent thereon must also now be free of the enablement rejection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are therefore respectfully urged.

It is submitted that all of the claims now present in the case clearly define over the references of record and fully comply with 35 U.S.C. 112. Reconsideration and allowance are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By /rlb/  
Roger L. Browdy  
Registration No. 25,618

RLB:jmd  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\I\inl2\wallach25\Pto\2007-09-04Amd.doc